

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 94 04:30:16 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #475
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 3 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 475

Today's Topics:

Courtesy In Amateur Radio
Even more interesting (was Re: Interes
Get Over It
Glass houses and those who live in them (2 msgs)
Ham Radio & More List
Interesting data
Newsgroup Suggestion (2 msgs)
Transmitter Sale to Non-Amateur?
Value of HF (was Get Over It

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 09:05:17 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Courtesy In Amateur Radio

bob.stanton@exchange.com (Bob Stanton) writes:

>From: bob.stanton@exchange.com
>Subj: Re: Courtesy In Amateur Radio

> >I am quickly getting fed up with HF. It seems bandwidth is eaten up by
> >nets, contests, or folks just ragchewing on and on and not letting anyone
> >else get a word in. I am talking specifically about 7245 and 3870 mHz.

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

This isn't HF, Bob!

> >These folks seem to want to muscle out everyone by using amps when they
> >probably don't need them. Don't FCC regulations require use of the minimum
> >amount of power to maintain communications?
> >A lot of the fun of HF seems to be going away beacuse of numerous nets
> >and contests.

> All this being done by those fine amateurs with coded
 ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

What's being done? HF consists of nets, contests, and ragchewing.

There's thousands of other frequencies other than 7245 and 3870 kHz.
Find a clear spot and call CQ if you don't like the nets. Or come
down to the CW subbands or Novice subbands and have some fun.

EVERY net has a period where they allow new checkins - that's the
time to give your name and callsign - later during the roundtable
they'll give you as much time as you'd like to speak. But you don't
just barge in - you wait until the net control asks for checkins.

The point of a net is for everyone to hear everyone else - high
power is typically used just for this purpose.

>licenses??? I thought the blame for ruining ham radio was the "No-code
>Technicians". Maybe I won't get a Technician Plus license, we don't
>seem to have problems like this on 2M.

The nets, contests, and ragchewing you hear on HF today are no different
than what's occured for the past 20 years.

73 from Hawaii,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 1994 06:58:55 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Even more interesting (was Re: Interes

In article <36bsc5\$edq@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com writes:

>Jeffrey@The.Big.Kahuna wrote:

>>But what happens outside the amateur community shouldn't effect us.
>>Did the amateur world shatter when long distance aviation comms
>>quit using CW? Do you recall the year or even the decade they
>>ceased using it? Of course not, for it had no impact upon us.

>

>Since the amateur service is expected to provide a pool of trained radio
>operators, technicians and experts (Part 97.1), the amateur service can
>not ignore what the rest of the radio folks are doing. If the use of CW
>is declining to a small amount in *services other than amateur radio*, then
>value of the pool of trained CW operators in the amateur service is less.

In my experience as a government/military radio operator I encountered
very few operators who were also hams. This idea that you have of
the amateur service providing a trained pool of ops for *outside*
the amateur service just does not occur. Our trained pool goes to
work on the *ham bands* during times of natural disasters. The
only exception I can think of was the conscription of hams during
WWII.

Some military/government/commercial radio ops do become hams (the ham
license is easy for them due to their training) but the opposite is
rare.

73 from lovely Hawaii,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 10:39:38 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Get Over It

jcumming@dgm.doc.ca (Jim Cummings) writes:

>Then why is CW prevalent only on HF and not on VHF and above?

CW is an excellent mode for working DX; not too much DX up there.

CW transmitters are dead easy to build for HF; one needs to be a
magician to build something for V/UHF and have it actually work.
Thus, we're at the mercy of what the manufacturers provide for us;
all mode xcvrs have a healthy price compared to an FM HT.

CW has historically been more prevalent on HF than on V/UHF; maybe
this is because the HF bands were first occupied with CW - other
modes and other bands came later. Thus, CW on HF became the norm.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 08:45:32 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Glass houses and those who live in them

In article <199410012203.PAA14529@ucsd.edu>
William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM writes:

>maybe jeff can down convert the L0 from one of those TV sets through a divider
>so he'd get low power and variable frequency...and yet another article...

Actually, very few QRP'ers are running crystal control today.

Sitting on the bench is the latest project: A 40M CW VFO'd QRP transmitter; the variable capacitor came from the UHF tuner of an old TV set (about 20 pF); in fact almost all the parts came from a TV, except for the handwound inductors, and the MPF-102 FET's (Radio Shack).

A fine example of a commercial QRP transceiver was the Heathkit HW-9; but today even better kits are being produced by QRP clubs around the country.

Those of you who are run QRO, on your next QSO try turning down your output power a little at a time; I bet you'll be able to reduce it by 50% and still get a good signal report from the other fellow.

Remember that the regulations **require** that we run as little power as possible!

Jeff NH6IL
^
Hawaii!

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 11:03:24 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Glass houses and those who live in them

brunelli_pc@delphi.com writes:

> Someone DF'd an HF nuisance in SoCal from Hawaii?

Pete: Do you suffer from dyscrasia? I never said I DF'd him; I don't have DF capabilities. But judging from all the cards, letters and even some phone calls I received (he was using my callsign) there's a **lot** of hams in SoCal who do have DF capabilities, and do use

them well. Tapes and other stuff have been turned over to the FCC. Thanks for your interest, though!

73 from beautiful Hawaii,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: 2 Oct 1994 14:59:21 GMT
From: lenwink@indirect.com (Len Winkler)
Subject: Ham Radio & More List

Ham Radio & More Station List:
The following list can change often....

Alabama: WHRT, 860am, Hartselle
WAJF, 1490am, Decatur
Arizona: KFNN, 1510am, Phoenix
Colorado: KBCO, 1190am, Denver/Boulder
Conneticut: WATR, 1320am, Hartford
Illinois: WKTA, 1330am, Chicago
WBGZ, 1570am, Alton
Indiana: WPDJ, 1300am, Huntington/Ft. Wayne
Kentucky: WMTA, 1380am, Central City
Massach: WSSH, 1510am, Boston (50,000 watts)
WKPE, 1170am, Orleans
Missouri: WBGZ, 1570am, St. Louis
N. Carolina: WEEB, 990am, Fayetteville
WCRY, 1460am, Raleigh/Durham
WNCT, 1070am, Greenville
Nebraska: KICS, 1550am, Hastings/Lincoln
Oklahoma: KTMC, 1400am, McAlester
Utah: K26DI, Channel 26, TV, Castledale

Ham Radio & More is on the Talk America Network. It is aired live every Sunday at 6:00pm EST, originating from Phoenix, Arizona. It can be heard via TVRO satellite on Spacenet 3, Transponder 9, 6.8 audio. Our toll free listener call-in line is 1-800-298-TALK. The originating station number is 1-602-241-1510 for more information. Any radio station can air the show FREE OF CHARGE.

73, Len, KB7LPW

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 10:42:46 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Interesting data

jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

> No worse than some people that know what their time is worth and as a
> result spend several hours salvaging parts from old TV sets instead of
> paying a few dollars for new parts.

I'll take the bait.

My niche in the hobby is building radios from scratch from scrounged components. I'm thrilled that this should bother you, though!

I've got better ways to spend my money than on radios: The average price of a house in Hawaii is \$300,000. On my college teacher's salary I need to save every penny for my someday-home.

I know what my time is worth - I spend 10 hours per day working on a Ph.D. So what do you do with your time, Angus?

Your best friend,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 10:25:33 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Newsgroup Suggestion

In article <1994Oct1.041227.7615@iitmax.iit.edu> CMSMANDELIN@minna.acc.iit.edu (The Artation) writes:

>I have a suggestion.

>

>Why don't we make a new group: rec.radio.amateur.CW.debate

>

>So that the actual FCC policy / rule / regulation discussions do not have
>to go into rec.radio.amateur.misc in order to get any bandwidth?

Once upon a time there was no .policy, and the code debate was on .misc. This newsgroup was created primarily to take the code debate off of .misc; just so other policy issues could be discussed this newsgroup was given a broader name than .code. [This is explained somewhere in some FAQ]. Other than the fun code debate, the only current policy issues are antenna restrictions, using ham equipment out of the ham bands, 'Why we hate repeater coordinating bodies', some QRP vs QRO discussion, building vs buying equipment (not really a policy issue unless we mention Part 97.1(d)).

.misc receives almost 100 articles daily; .policy gets maybe

25 per day; even fewer if Dan and I go on vacation!

Jeff N Hawaii 6IL

Date: 3 Oct 1994 00:09:28 GMT
From: billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake)
Subject: Newsgroup Suggestion

The Artation (CMSMANDELIN@minna.acc.iit.edu) wrote:
: I have a suggestion.

: Why don't we make a new group: rec.radio.amateur.CW.debate

Actually, I think it is a good idea, and the name should be:
rec.radio.amateur.CW-testing

: Also, those persons who wish to debate the merit of CW can do so, while the
: others can UNSUB that group.

: ** NOTE: ** I am NOT trying to make a snide comment. I am NOT bitching.
: I am making an HONEST suggestion. Please do not take it the wrong way.

As above, I think the idea makes very good sense because the CW
testing discussion/debate does predominate the .policy group.

--
Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)
Budd Lake, New Jersey

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 13:04:58 GMT
From: jjmartin@world.std.com (James J Martin)
Subject: Transmitter Sale to Non-Amateur?

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:
: In article <Cw7o9v.C6K@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu
:(Jeffrey Herman) writes:
: >
: >> Again, licensing status should have nothing to do with it. Yes, it
: >> is even
: >> legal to sell modified for 27 MHz equipment to CB'ers. Linears, echo
: >> mikes, roger beeps, and etc. the whole nine yards.

I currently work with the business of selling amateur radio equipment. I
will sell anyone any radio they plop down plastic, green, or whatever

negotiable stock they may own (you know what I mean) :) to purchase said item with.

I will not provide anyone with modification information unless they provide sufficient evidence they are licensed and authorized to have such modifications for out of amateur band operation, e.g. CAP, MARS, etc.

New amplifiers sold in this country will not have 12, 11, or 10 meters installed albeit they may have the capability to be modified but I will sell an amplifier to anyone who wants one and pays for. It is not illegal to do so. What is illegal is the purchaser's use of the item where there exists a prohibition. I will tell them at the time of the sale that the amplifier is not for use on Class D citizen band. If the person is a ham I just sell it to them, no questions asked. Yes, I do ask for callsigns as the database is sorted that way. If the individual does not have a callsign, I take it on a case by case basis.

If someone comes right out and tells me they want a particular piece of amateur radio gear for use on 27 MHz, I will not sell it to them. If they have an amateur license I will sell it to them. Bottom line is a little common sense goes a long way. I notice that via the keyboard common sense remains in the bit bucket and things can get outlandishly ridiculous.

My \$.02 worth.

P.S. If you don't work in the business of selling amateur radio or related gear, why worry about it? You'll probably never be affected by what you speak of.

73 de Jim
WK1V

My opinion has nothing to do with my employer (who shall remain nameless here). It is mine, I own it but I also share it. :)

Date: Sun, 02 Oct 1994 20:51:37 GMT
From: rheiss@harp.aix.calpoly.edu (Robert Everitt Heiss)
Subject: Value of HF (was Get Over It)

In article <6823@tdbunews.teradata.COM> jpc@ElSegundoCA.NCR.COM writes:
>Anyway, don't ignore this small group of people that depend on HF.
>Unfortunately, many of the nets have moved to marine SSB to avoid ham jamming :-)

How would you feel if I took a boat out just to have a big signal on

160 meters? Left the sails on shore, and motored through your regatta with a cage vertical in place of the mast? You could tell right away that I didn't love sailing.

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 19:49:49 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<1994Sep30.171740.8433@clark.dgim.doc.ca> <Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<36mtnd\$iqs@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <36mtnd\$iqs@nntpd.lkg.dec.com> little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little) writes:

>
>In article <Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>
>|>CW has historically been more prevalent on HF than on V/UHF; maybe
>|>this is because the HF bands were first occupied with CW - other
>|>modes and other bands came later. Thus, CW on HF became the norm.
>
>Has become "the norm" on some segments of the HF bands. Given that
>CW and data are the predominate mode on less than half the HF allocations,
>and CW is generally found in less than half that allocation, stop
>trying to imply that CW is the predominate mode. It's not. Maybe you
>believe that restating this misfact often enough will cause it to become
>fact, but fortunately the truth doesn't work that way.

Hey, good job of twisting my words, Todd! You deleted someone else's query as to why CW is prevalent on HF and not on VHF and above. NOW maybe my statement will make more sense to you.

BTW, do the British have a 75 MHz/4 meter band? A British newsletter over on .misc implied that they do.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 2 Oct 1994 18:21:33 GMT
From: little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)

References<pYw0Q3T.edellers@delphi.com> <1994Sep30.171740.8433@clark.dgim.doc.ca>,
<Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Reply-To: little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

|>CW has historically been more prevalent on HF than on V/UHF; maybe
|>this is because the HF bands were first occupied with CW - other
|>modes and other bands came later. Thus, CW on HF became the norm.

Has become "the norm" on some segments of the HF bands. Given that CW and data are the predominate mode on less than half the HF allocations, and CW is generally found in less than half that allocation, stop trying to imply that CW is the predominate mode. It's not. Maybe you believe that restating this misfact often enough will cause it to become fact, but fortunately the truth doesn't work that way.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 20:30:26 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<3697qu\$1q1@news.iastate.edu> <CwszG9.80E@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<36bs5p\$39g@news.iastate.edu>
Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu
Subject: Re: Even more interesting (was Re: Interesting data)

(William J Turner) writes:

(Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>But what happens outside the amateur community shouldn't effect us.
>>Did the amateur world shatter when long distance aviation comms
>>quit using CW? Do you recall the year or even the decade they
>>ceased using it? Of course not, for it had no impact upon us.
>
>It does matter when you use it (in the form of a trained reserve of
>radio operators) to justify keeping the morse code requirements. If no
>one else uses morse code, there is no reason to keep a trained reserve
>of people who know it.

In my experience as a government/military radio operator I encountered very few operators who were also hams. This idea that you have of the amateur service providing a trained pool of ops for *outside*

the amateur service just does not occure. Our trained pool goes to work on the *ham bands* during times of natural disasters. The only exception I can think of was the conscription of hams during WWII.

Some military ops do become hams (the ham license is easy after the training they've received from the military), but the opposite is rare.

73 from lovely Hawaii,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: 2 Oct 1994 22:22:44 GMT
From: wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner)

References<CwszG9.80E@news.Hawaii.Edu> <36bs5p\$39g@news.iastate.edu>,
<Cx2BMq.A96@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject: Re: Even more interesting (was Re: Interesting data)

In article <Cx2BMq.A96@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:
>In my experience as a government/military radio operator I encountered
>very few operators who were also hams. This idea that you have of
>the amateur service providing a trained pool of ops for *outside*
>the amateur service just does not occure. Our trained pool goes to
>work on the *ham bands* during times of natural disasters. The
>only exception I can think of was the conscription of hams during
>WWII.

From reading Part 97, it would seem (at least) to me that one of the objectives is to have a pool of trained radio operators, *period*. At one time, this was probably very important to the rest of the communications community. Maybe it isn't so important anymore, but by the same token morse code isn't so important anymore, in or out of the ham bands. Especially outside the ham bands.

Until this post, no one ever said (at least as far as I saw) that they were restricting the pool of trained operators to just the ham bands. This would put a different slant on the argument.

This just demonstrates that what you say is not always what you mean, and that others may always misinterpret you, unless you are very specific. Please_be_specific_from_now_on!!

Date: 2 Oct 1994 11:21:32 -0500

From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<pYw0Q3T.edellers@delphi.com> <1994Sep30.171740.8433@clark.dgim.doc.ca>,
<Cx1KA3.wo@news.hawaii.edu>
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <Cx1KA3.wo@news.hawaii.edu>,
Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:
>jcumming@dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings) writes:
>
>>Then why is CW prevelant only on HF and not on VHF and above?
>
>CW is an excellent mode for working DX; not too much DX up there.

Hummmm....I've worked CW transcontinental on VHF and above...via OSCAR 11.

--

"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 94 21:05:56 -0500
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<36c4eq\$kdf@news.u.washington.edu> <5s5WY50.edellers@delphi.com>,
<milcomCx03tG.3Eu@netcom.com>
Subject: Re: 900mhz phone questions.

wayne roberts <milcom@netcom.com> writes:

>why? when hams are allowed to run 1500w max. 902-928Mhz is a ham band.
>As long as your following part97 - which includes _identification_ - then
>you should be legit. Correct me if 900mhz phones radiate outside the
>902-928mhz band.

But then you wouldn't be dealing with a "cordless phone" situation -- you'd
have to follow ALL of Part 97, including the rules for automatic control
(of the base unit) and prohibited communications.

Date: 3 Oct 1994 02:49:33 GMT
From: jrbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ)

References<1994Sep30.171740.8433@clark.dgim.doc.ca> <Cx1KA3.wo@news.hawaii.edu>,
<36mmmc\$ejq@sugar.neosoft.com>
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <36mmmc\$ejq@sugar.neosoft.com>,
Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:

>Hummmm....I've worked CW transcontinental on VHF and above...via OSCAR 11.

Hmmmmmm.....without a license?

W5GYJ

Date: 2 Oct 1994 22:40:22 -0500
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<Cx1KA3.wo@news.hawaii.edu> <36mmmc\$ejq@sugar.neosoft.com>,
<36nrft\$k47@chnews.intel.com>
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <36nrft\$k47@chnews.intel.com>,
Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com> wrote:
>In article <36mmmc\$ejq@sugar.neosoft.com>,
>Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:
>
>>Hummmm....I've worked CW transcontinental on VHF and above...via OSCAR 11.
>
>Hmmmmmm.....without a license?

You must have me confused with a Codeless Technician, Jim.

--
"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

Date: Sun, 2 Oct 1994 19:43:35 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<Cw7o9v.C6K@news.Hawaii.Edu> <1994Sep17.230407.2813@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<Cx1r0B.1x6@world.std.com>
Subject: Re: Transmitter Sale to Non-Amateur?

In article <Cx1r0B.1x6@world.std.com> jjmartin@world.std.com (James J Martin)
writes:
>Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:
>: In article <Cw7o9v.C6K@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu
>:(Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>: >
>: >> Again, licensing status should have nothing to do with it. Yes, it
>: >> is even
>: >> legal to sell modified for 27 MHz equipment to CB'ers. Linears, echo
>: >> mikes, roger beeps, and etc. the whole nine yards.

James: I did not write the above; do be more careful with the attribution.

Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #475
